

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed January 28, 2004. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-15 were pending in this Application. Claims 1-15 were rejected. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, and 12 have been amended to further define various features of Applicants' invention. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-14 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,438,716 issued to Jeffrey Phillip Snover ("Snover"). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit the Snover does not anticipate the present invention because Snover does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the limitations of the present Claims.

Snover is directed to a system for "generating and displaying error messages based upon non-local contextual information." Col.1, lines 12-14. Snover defines 'contextual information' as "information that a user or system administrator may define and that need not have any relationship to a particular operating state or context that exists or that is operating at the time of the particular error generation". Col. 5, lines 35. Snover further recites:

Thus, for example, the error message may be a composite of the error message normally associated with the current error, together with additional information. Alternatively, the error message may be a function of the current error and the error context by simply refining or replacing the error message normally associated with the current error. In either case, preferably the current error condition and the non-contextual information associated therewith determine the composition of the given error message provided to the user.

Col. 5, lines 47-55. Snover then goes on to describe examples of error messages provided in specific situations. Specifically, examples 1-4 are provided in Column 5.

The Claims of the present disclosure, as amended, specifically recite the use of event codes to identify frequently asked question (FAQ) files that relate to the particular failure event. Specifically, Independent Claim 1 recites, among other limitations, "parsing the error log for the one or more stored event codes if the event codes compare to one or more determined values; and relating the parsed event codes to one or more frequently asked question (FAQ) files." Independent Claim 6 recites, among other limitations computer code operable to cause a processor to, "parse the error log for the one or more stored event codes if the event codes compare to one or more determined values; and relate the parsed one or more event codes to one or more frequently asked question (FAQ) files." And Independent Claim 11 recites, among other limitations, executable instruction configures to, "parse the error log for the stored one or more event codes if the one or more event codes compare to one or more determined values" and to "relate the parsed event codes to one or more frequently asked question (FAQ) files."

Applicants respectfully submit that Snover does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of event codes to relate FAQ files as recited in Independent Claims 1, 6, and 11. Accordingly, Snover cannot anticipate Claims 1, 6, 11 or Claims 2-4, 7-9, or 12-14 which depend therefrom. Applicants request that Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and allow Claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-14.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5, 10, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Snover in view of U.S. Patent 6,243,090 issued to Nagabhushan Rao Machiraju et al. ("Machiraju"). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that Claims 5, 10 and 15 depend from Claims that have now been placed in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant request that Examiner withdraw the rejections to Claims 5, 10 and 15 under §103(a) and fully allow Claims 5, 10, and 15.

ATTORNEY DOCKET
016295.1089
(DC-03069)

PATENT APPLICATION
09/854,364

9

CONCLUSION

Applicants have now made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the amendments and remarks set forth above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claims 1-15 as amended.

Applicants believe there are no fees due at this time, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees to Deposit Account No. 02-0383 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.322.2548.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorney for Applicants



Brian E. Szymczak
Reg. No. 47,120

Date: April 27, 2004

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Baker Botts L.L.P.

CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. **23640**

512.322.2548

512.322.8340 (fax)